

M E E T I N G M I N U T E S

Meeting: Evergreen Visioning Project Meeting #21

Date: November 3, 2004

Task Force Members Present: Homing Yip, Jenny Chang, Scott Nickle, Tom Andrade, Vikki Lang, Mark Milioto, Steven Moore, Steve Tedesco, Alan Covington, Jim Zito, Bill Kozlovsky, Tian Zhang, Elias Portales, Dan Gould, Dan Jacobs, Lou Kvitek, Mike Alvarado, Tom Andrade, Victor Klee, Vince Songcayawon, Sherry Gilmore, Sylvia Alvarez, Chris Corpus, Jose Aranda, Khanh Nguyen, Gordon Lund, Lillian Jones

Members of the Public Present: Ernie Lipari, Robert & Theresa Lorenzo, Beverly Bryant, Jean Phillips, Loree Kant, Yolanda Amaro, Katja Irvin, Dean Davidson, Ralph Marsh, Evelyn Allen, Paul Torres, Marie Sinatra, Ellie Glass, Theodore & Patricia Cuadros, Diane Zarate, Betty Martinez, Shawna Sanders, Randy Mahrer, Steve Bennette, Lyle Telford, Allen Blue, Hiep Nguyen, Dan Reyes, Bill & Carol Ashman, Marco Romero, Eric Z., David Zenker, Ralph Portillo, Patrick Hendry, Donna White, Jeanette Newman, Amber Zundel, Janet Castaneda, James Kawamoto, John & Lori Truitt, Tony Seebach, Marc & Darlene Moran, Terry Gotcher, Joseph Marquessa, Bruce Race, Lila DeLong, Jacobs, Susan Conrow, Mary Kolb, Jennifer Dinis, Joseph Aranda

Developer Community Present: Tom Armstrong, Bo Rodanovich, Steve Dunn, Joe Sordi, Gerry De Young, Mike Hill, Jim Eller, Myron Crawford, Bonnie Moss

Staff Present: Councilmember Dave Cortese, Laurel Prevetti, Andrew Crabtree, John Baty, Kerynn Gianotti, Rabia Chaudhry

Welcome and Introductions

Councilmember Dave Cortese welcomed the group and explained that people have been meeting over 14 months to talk about their short-term and long-term views on infill development. The Task Force has met a lot lately so there is no need for introductions. Cortese gave an overview of the evening, explaining that Mike Alvarado would give a report out on the caucus. Rabia Chaudhry will explain the handouts everyone has received. Laurel Prevetti will review the updated workplan. The two previous meeting minutes will be approved – the Task Force had already reviewed them during the previous week. There next will be a discussion on the proposed land use concepts for Evergreen Valley College and Pleasant Hills Golf Course. We'll try to salvage enough time for a sub committee discussion but that could be deferred to the 12/1 EVP or a subsequent caucus. Members of the public will be given a 15-minute comment period at the end.

Report Out from Task Force Caucus

Alvarado explained that after the October EVP, the task force itself decided it needed to caucus alone. The group met at the Pala Rancho Cabana Club on 10/21/04 and discussed, amongst other things, operating principles and ways to conduct work and how to work toward a consensus framework. The caucus presented their recommendations to Cortese and received good feedback, which was in turn cycled back through the Task Force. The caucus convened again on 11/1/04 and discussed how the Guiding Principles need to be used and measured against proposals.

These principles do not need to be changed now but if they need to be in the future, that will be taken up again. They also discussed the need for outreach and situation analysis. Alvarado said the caucus would like to meet in advance of the 12/1/04 meeting and that a major topic of discussion would be the EIR along with outreach, and how to work with developers. Alvarado posed a series of dates for this next caucus and the group agreed to 11/16/04 at a location to be announced. Alvarado said he chaired last two caucuses and is willing to chair again. Jim Zito asked if any dates one week earlier to 11/13 could be considered. The majority of the task force still seemed able to meet on 11/16. Alvarado also commented that he has received good feedback from Cortese – captured in a memo, Cortese plans to make final revisions and make that available again to the task force.

Chaudhry reviewed with the task force the various handouts they had received:

- ⇒ Updated workplan
- ⇒ Draft 9/22/04 meeting minutes
- ⇒ Draft 10/6/04 meeting minutes
- ⇒ EVCC Opportunity Site Diagram
- ⇒ FAQ about EVP Outreach
- ⇒ Task Force Caucus Notes
- ⇒ EVP/Smart Growth Strategy Process Diagram

Updated Workplan

Prevetti reviewed the updated workplan with the group. She explained how it is an accounting of what's been done and what remains to be done. She called attention to the last page, which was a projection of upcoming meetings. She said that at the 12/1 EVP, the school superintendents will be present. The Task Force also needs to start talking about the new traffic policy and how that will work. There will be future discussions on the financing district, so many key issues remain because they will be the nexus between the land use plans with issues of concerns. Fall 2005 is the new projected completion date for EVP going to Council. She also referred to the EVP/Smart Growth Strategy Process Diagram explaining how it graphically depicts the workplan and delineates opportunities for outreach.

Cortese asked if there were any questions on the handouts. Alan Covington requested that for each meeting minutes, the attendees be listed. Cortese said that it is included on the revised document. Listing attendees is customary and will be done. Vikki Lang noted that the header/footer dates were inconsistent. Zito said his name was missing from the 10/6 attendance. *Jenny Chang said neither her name nor Homing Yip's name were on the 9/22 or 10/6 minutes. Tian Zhang said her name was missing on the 9/22 and 10/6 meeting minutes. Gilmore asked what changes were here. Chaudhry said those received by email from the Task Force. Cortese said that in the future we will highlight any changes from the draft to the final document. Gilmore asked for a clarification of Cortese's comments regarding what the major opportunity sites could currently build-out as. Cortese said that we'd work with Gilmore to make sure the question is answered in the minutes properly. He asked if there were further questions or comments. There was no dissent to adoption of the minutes

**At the conclusion of the 11/3 Task Force Meeting Rabia Chaudhry conferred with Jenny Chang and Tian Zhang. it was determined that Jenny Chang's name was indeed in the 9/22 minutes. It*

was determined that Homing Yip did not attend the 10/6 meeting. It was determined that Tian Zhang did not attend the 9/22 meeting. The other changes were made.

Review & Discuss Land Use Alternatives

Cortese said that he had discussed offline with some of the Task Force members about the consensus process utilized in EVP. Most of the group was here and remember that in devising the Guiding Principles we worked through a consensus process all the way through. It was arduous but we got through it and the document that resulted is one that everyone can say contains common principles we all agree with. What we want to do now is use the GPs to arrive at various positions along the way. What we are going to do in the next couple of weeks is build on the EVP/Smart Growth Strategy document even more so, so that the key decision points will have stop signs where we can step back and examine and evaluate. Tonight what we want to do is go through the remaining site plans with an eye toward whether or not they're consistent with the GPs. The position we're trying to arrive at is a generally agreeable plan, consistent with the GPs. We have, at the task force's request, have added more detail to the plans. It is my feeling that the developers are not looking for commitment on all the details but are presenting the details so you can get a better feel for the big picture items. The maps that just had colors – we used them some months back - you could scope an EIR just with that level of detail. All we need on these site plans is enough of a position to scope an EIR. So what you should be asking along the way of Prevetti is how much just for scoping the EIR guidance is needed. That is an issues discussion. We will be using an interests (our guiding principles) - issues (questions/challenges) - position (prelim site plan that can become something to get feedback from community, be used to scope EIR, etc) model to review the remaining site plans. If someone makes a comment off this model then Cortese will interrupt. Ike White asked that since the community is present, could we use 40 seconds to inform as to the purpose of task force and how it blends in with information that goes back to community. Everyone should know this is not a set in stone type of meeting. Cortese said that White is right, for the record. The positions achieved here need to be vetted by community. Mark Milioto added that hopefully the handouts would help convey this.

Prevetti said we need to be mindful of the time and limit speaking.

Pleasant Hills Golf Course

Prevetti delved into the golf course by stating that there were previous comments about wanting the city or county to buy this land and turn it into a park. The City does not have the fiscal resources to do that. Therefore, how can we balance preserving a fair amount of open space with residential development to create value to fund amenities and transportation improvements? Prevetti asked Mark Day to explain in detail the land use design. Day apologized for missing the last meeting. He said that when we started this discussion, KB had supplied some concepts and feedback from the Task Force had generated more iteration. There were comments about a 9-hole golf course and one land use design showed that element. There was also mention of perimeter conditions that led to the idea of edge treatment and a park along the periphery. There were further requests to have a usable park to hold sports fields, soccer, etc and so that concept was introduced. Finally, someone had suggested a commercial additional, hence its placement. Day added that this current design highlights questions about like for like lot sizes, traffic calming, connectivity to schools on Flint Avenue, etc. The current design also shows possible housing types, some of which can be found in Evergreen already. These are not five story high buildings. They are high quality housing types.

Prevetti said that the task force should have this diagram in a reduced form – these were distributed at an earlier meeting. The total number of housing units is 700-900, plus 20 acres of open space. She asked for Task Force comments/observations as they relate to the GPs.

White asked that considering the unit count, what kind of attendance factor are we talking about? What elementary school boundary would be responsible for this influx? Looking at these housing types, how will that blend into the currently established community on Vista Verde and Flinthaven? Prevetti responded that the first issue regarding schools – Andrew Crabtree will write this on our issues list – the three affected school superintendents will be at the next meeting and we will record these comments to discuss with them. Regarding the second question – staff is asking the task force this. What needs to be done to make the design stronger? Scott Nickle asked if the large lots on the design are comparable to what's there. Day said yes, as big or larger. Dan Jacobs asked if we have the number of units per acre. Day said he would provide that information. Prevetti estimated that it's about 8 units /acre. Zito asked if the proposed lots along the north are comparable as far as lot sizes and what is the unit to acre? Day said the lots along the north are not like but he asked the Task Force to consider setback, not size. If setbacks are similar then that achieves a similar effect. There is a doubletree canopy here and Day feels it should be kept to serve as a buffer. Preserving buffer may be more important than like for like size. The overall average is 7 units to an acre but townhomes are plugged in as well. That's not a lot denser than what's around here. Zito recommended that the EVP design guidelines specify equal or greater setbacks than what the citywide design guidelines specify. Prevetti said design guidelines would be created for all four sites.

Chris Corpus asked what the traffic flow is in/out of here? How will it affect Tully Road and neighbors in back? Day said there was egress along the west, south (along existing intersection), the lower east side and the north.

White said that traffic flow from White Road to Flint Avenue needs to be enabled and we need to see automobile and pedestrian flow.

Alvarado said that the task force had talked about a plan where there would be a downsized but usable golf course. Tonight's plan doesn't show this. He also asked about the integration on Tully Road and the traffic calming along Tully – since there is already an impact. Could a plan support green space over/beyond the open space? Prevetti responded by asking for suggestions for distributing green space. More along edges? We received comments at the 11/1 Pleasant Hills meeting that the proposed park is too interior. Alvarado said that if there was an ongoing use of a golf course – how much acreage would a course entail. Prevetti said staff would study the option of a course. Day said we did go through this – it's 100 acres for a municipal course and this property in total is 115 acres. We previously depicted a 9-hole course around the perimeter but the concern was that I had used a 250-foot diameter circle and it was small. There was concern about balls flying in proximity to homes. Alvarado asked how this design integrates with the Barone property. Prevetti said there is interest by the owner for a place of worship. Alvarado asked about the flood zone area – what mitigation issues will need to be undertaken? Prevetti said there are a host of wet spots, low water flow, etc. All of these will be examined via the EIR. Lou Kvitek asked about the edge condition where the linear parks are on Tully and White. What is the motivation for putting parks on roads that are busy? Day responded that the task force commented that it would be nice to have open space on the edge since existing neighbors are used to looking into open space. We don't have to keep this and the design could flip around.

White asked what is the buffer on the northeast and on Vista Verde. Day said it mirrors the edge conditions but we can ask KB to take a row of homes off, preserve trees, etc. Alvarado commented that the Pala Rancho Cabana Club is adjacent to the course. None of the development would affect it, right? Prevetti said that is correct. Alvarado asked if the golf course property has, from the start, always been part of the landowner group.

Cortese said that if you're asking if all four sites came into this process at same time then the answer is yes and no. KB didn't have an option to buy the golf course when the EVP property owners first started organizing. However for the last year or more KB has been involved in the consortium. Victor Klee said he thought we saw a plan that had a course and we said we didn't like it and that it wasn't financially feasible. Prevetti said staff would document more rigorously the option of a site with a course. Gordon Lund emphasized the need to keep a nice street area along White since we're used to seeing a golf course. Milioto said that PHGC reminded him of Mirassou and the Cortese property development since it was all infill. We should ask those residents how that infill development did. Gillmore asked if the existing neighbors could use the proposed green space in a usable way? Can it be more than just pretty landscaping? Zito added that we should try to add half stories so it's more transitional. Cortese said this was also one of our GPs. Sylvia Alvarez said she wanted the open space to contain open fields for soccer, baseball. A member of the public asked if he could speak on this matter. Cortese said there was time on the agenda for public comment. He asked the task force if we should ask Day or the developer to walk both designs (one with a course and one without) through the GPs to see if they conform. Alvarado said it would be good if the developers could tell us how, relative to the GPs, these designs stack up. Jacobs asked what mechanism there is to determine if a 9-hole course is feasible. Cortese said a formal study would be needed— perhaps a request for proposal or request for qualifications. This can be a stop sign in the process if the Task Force and community so desire. Zito said that we don't have to preserve 700-900 units. What happens when you reduce units and increase open space? Cortese responded that we are trying to get something presentable to the community. Do we want it in ranges?

Alvarado said this is why the caucus is important – the ranges will be a big topic of discussion. Cortese said we'd table for now the ranges issue until the caucus. He asked if the group also wanted to table the course analysis. Bill Kozlovsky said this has been previously discussed. Cortese said we'd wait till the caucus since some want to rehash this issue and others don't. Kvitek commented that perhaps the developers could give money to Pala Rancho to expand their facility.

Prevetti said that time was up and we need to move on to EVC. The college has hired its own architect to start looking at this site and reminded the group we're only talking about a portion of the college. She further reminded the group that the Vice Chancellor said the college needs to create lease revenue to support educational programming.

Cortese interjected that members of the public can hand written comments to Kerynn Gianotti of his office. If we can't respond tonight they will be responded to by email or on a later meeting agenda.

Evergreen Valley College

Mike Hill, Vice Chancellor of Evergreen Valley College, explained that the college is part of a college district that also contains City College. Their service area is the San Jose Unified School District, the East Side Union High School District and the Milpitas School District. The district is a

public agency. He urged the group to discuss the “what” and the “why” of the proposal. He explained that the college masterplan calls for site development and that the college has previously said no for 20 years to private developers until the masterplan was completed to determine what the college needed for educational purposes. The map being distributed is a footprint for the entire site. The college realized it had extra land for revenue generation purposes. The masterplan calls for a 20000-student build-out and currently there are 11000 students. This is a longterm plan and the emphasis is on EVC’s capacity to serve the community. The land won’t ever be sold.

Hill continued by saying the land use map has changed slightly - the college is not so far along in the process. EVC is not looking to subsidize development for the benefit of another party. Rather, they’re trying to maximize value for our community and students. Why? Because it’s difficult to successfully run a college on the state budget. Tom Andrade can relate to this as he unfortunately lost an important parcel tax last night by 100 votes.

EVC receives its accreditation from the Western Association for Colleges and Universities – we risk not meeting their standards and losing accreditation. This proposed development is part of a start to meet their standards. Also, there are housing needs for faculty, students and service workers. We looked at the EVP GPs as to how our proposal responds and it’s fairly well. The college’s governing board, which we keep apprised – has told us to start reaching out to neighbors. We’ll begin soon, but wanted to make sure we’re doing this in conjunction with the Task Force. Are there ideas on how to do this well?

Zhang asked about Measure G, which is to buy land. Why do this when you’re using up your land for development? Hill responded by first thanking votes for passing the measure. That measure deals with constructing/equipping facilities. It doesn’t deal with staffing/lighting and other operational issues. We serve a large geographic area. Milpitas is part of our district. We’ve run classes in Milpitas but the lack of facilities has made it difficult. Milpitas tells us we need a greater presence there. Milpitas pays and contributes but feels they don’t get benefits. So G is part of a longer vision to purchase land nearer to/in Milpitas.

Zhang said that this area is growing. How can you envision shrinking college land in Evergreen while more houses go up? How do you justify this? Hill asked the group to remember that the area is designed to carry 20000 students. A college differs from an elementary or high school because you can structure programs differently (nights/weekends). Doing this we feel we can meet student demand as well as generate revenue and serve housing needs.

Zito asked how the college would deal with wide range income levels. EVC will own the land but not buildings so if an apartment owners walks away, who is left in charge? Hill said that even with their current shopping center, they have the safest ground lease – a fixed rate of rent, good roi, only allow development on from folks who have the financial backing to pay in bad times. Plus, the college does not allow the land to be subordinated against the lease. Therefore there are many protections for the district. Zito said the group was concerned about someone walking away and the buildings becoming a slum. Hill reminded the group that this property is in their backyard and it reflects directly on the college.

Day noted that tonight’s plan tonight drops 100 units from what has been previously shown. This is a good site for a density mixed use village. It is an opportunity to bring in affordable housing, walkability to shops, library, office space, etc. The plan calls for retail along San Felipe – near the college entrance – a good location for restaurants, which is part of the GPs. The housing has parking in center, and housing all around to hide the parking structure. There is an increased park size.

Yip asked how the additional college expansion would be financed– come back to voters? How does that reconcile with operating revenue that would come from leases. Regarding housing, the area is already zoned residential – these plans call for multiplying units by thousands, leading to concerns with traffic.

Hill said that the bond passed last night pays for capital improvements of campus build out for facilities but it doesn't provide any operational funds. Revenues from a new lease would enhance operational needs. For example the EVC nurses program – this is desperately needed but the state doesn't pay for it. Regarding density – EVP's GPs talk about mixed use and community diversity – our proposal helps match these GPs.

Kozlovsky asked that a stop sign be placed on the traffic portion of this project. The Yerba Buena/San Felipe intersection needs analysis given the already heavy traffic. Prevetti said that the traffic issues won't be answered tonight but will be answered in the workplan. Cortese said that all of these plans have huge footnotes for school impact and traffic – this is understood. Covington asked about the intent to have student/faculty housing within this complex and its affordability. Hill replied that it would be "workforce housing" – not dorms but units for singles. What we know for sure is that when trying to recruit staff and faculty, we have a difficult time due to the cost of living here. Other public agencies are struggling with housing now – we hope to address this. We may not be using a standard affordability formula but we do want to be affordable for the workforce. Maybe we take a lesser return per unit but this needs to be worked through. Covington asked if it would be rental, ownership or both. Hill said both, but on leased property. The college has visited other sites like this – CSU by Oxnard, CSU Monterey. Nickle asked if the college expects to be able to contribute to EVP amenities and Hill said yes, dependent on what housing and types of associated assessments. It wouldn't be at the rate as other types of housing though. Prevetti added that the group studied the value of products for amenities – rough estimates of relative values done in June indicated that single family ownership brings in the most revenue and other products brought in less. This can be another stop sign issue.

Lund asked how much the college gets from the current business on San Felipe/Yerba Buena and what percentage that is of the operating budget. What is anticipated of the new retail and what percent would that be of the operating budget? Hill replied that initial appraisal work has been done to determine the value of the land. For EVC, an annual return of two to four million on what could be developed is expected. EVC's annual general fund operating budget is 68 million. These revenues would help to not have to cut sections, etc. Lund asked what the current retail generates. Hill said the 6-acre development current ground rent is \$400,000 a year. It will go up due to lease structure. It will grow at a profitable rate for us for the college and 15-20 years from now it can kick up if the center's value increases more than anticipated.

Prevetti said these were all good questions with respect to the financial arrangements but we need to return to land use. She asked the group if there was comfort in this design for additional outreach. Cortese asked that each comment be framed with respect to the GPs. Alvarado also asked the group to look through the lens of overall benefit to the district. He asked how far south is the service area of the college district? What are the provisions for transit south? What are the traffic standards given the current retail is a tough place to navigate. Zhang agreed, stating that the parking lot and intersection are dangerous for kids. Cortese said the city calls these issues traffic calming. This is part of our GPs and not something for which we have to wait for an EIR or traffic model. We can have dot do a mock study and bring this information back.

Tedesco commented that this proposal doesn't have all the GPs but no project will. It meets multiple GPs though and no land use plan will hit all of them. Cortese agreed and also asked the

group to consider if a proposal violates any GP. Tedesco agreed, but added that he would hate to see us in compliance with 10 GPs and in conflict with 1. We need to give weight to projects that meet a lot of them.

Zito said this proposal lends itself well to high density, affordability and the GPs. He is concerned with the proposed 70,000 commercial pad and its competition with arcadia and any existing struggling commercial. Is there a backup plan if commercial isn't viable? Prevetti said the retail consultant will be able to answer these questions.

Jacobs said that once we have gone through all the properties we need to make sure every GP is hit by at least one of them.

Alvarez asked how housing could be set-aside for certain workers. Cortese said that on school owned sites, if housing is dedicated for teachers/students, then there is no conflict with fair housing laws. This cannot be done on non-school sites.

Zhang said that one major GP is that development has to be consistent with the existing environment. The current zoning of the surrounding neighborhood land is 8000 sf / unit, producing about 38 homes. Is the neighborhood zoning a joke or does this proposal ignore the zoning?

White asked if the housing proposed for college faculty could also accommodate non EVC teachers.

Alvarado asked when the retail study would start. Prevetti said staff is working with RDA and OED. They have been told to have the results in time for the January 2005 Task Force Meeting.

Vince Songcayawon said that one GP is for homeownership. Arcadia and EVC allow rental and ownership. Do we need to agree on a percent of rental/ownership? Nickle said that on both the industrial and PHGC, there would be almost entirely ownership. Prevetti said we could inquire of the college as to their intentions on this.

Public Comments

Cortese invited the public to give one-minute comments, adding that it doesn't preclude the opportunity for followup discussion later.

1. David Zenker – lives just north of EVC. Understands what EVC is trying to achieve and appreciates outreach planned. He feels that townhomes facing existing single-family homes doesn't meet GP. He also feels that placing retail next to homes doesn't make sense. Why split retail? Put the open space and library next to the existing homes and place the retail on YB. The supermarket shouldn't be across street from homes.

2. Ellie Glass – represent Pala Rancho. We don't want our golf course developed. If you are going to, you need to reach out to the public and know what we feel about this. I am a fifth generation Californian and a 4th generation San Josean. The golf course property was owned by my family generations ago as part of the 520 acre Marten Ranch. My grandfather's vision was for this to remain open space. We're approaching build-out. Reconsider all of this. I plan to live here another 40 years. Our neighborhood is 40 years old.

3. Stateman Ed – lived in Evergreen for 28 years. We have an airport, a college and a golf course. It's sad to see how the PHGC owner is letting a father's dream go and mess up kids' heritage. It's a poor school district. Traffic will be hell. This should have been on the ballot on 11/2, why wasn't it? We vote on open space all the time. My property tax will soon reach the same payment as my house cost. Put houses in coyote valley. Enough is enough. We used to have orchards here.

4. Rhonda Garcia – lives near PHGC, three houses from one of the proposed street outages. Four exits for a 700 unit area – two cars per home. Put next meeting at Valle Vista Elementary School. This is the first time that this community has heard about this. The neighbors do not know

about this. There is a meeting tomorrow at Pala Rancho and we're going to discuss this. We are not Evergreen. We don't get the Evergreen Times. Where does everyone on Task Force live?

5. Marc Moran - only 2 entrances to EVC. Any plans for more parking for students?

Cortese asked the task force for items for the next agenda. The group decided to wait until we hear from the next caucus.

Andrade commented that he appreciated the group working off the agenda and staying on task.

The meeting adjourned at 930PM.